

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,701	06/23/2003	Richard Newton Hill JR.	5740 EXAMINER	
75	590 11/30/2006			
RICHARD NEWTON HILL, JR. 1960 EMMITSBURG RD.			FREAY, CHARLES GRANT	
GETTYSBURG	- 		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			3746	
		·	DATE MAILED: 11/30/2006	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				<u>V</u>
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		10/600,701	HILL, RICHARD NEWTON	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Charles G. Freay	3746	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.11 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D. (35 U.S.C. § 133)	
Status				
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>13 O</u> . This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		
Dispositi	on of Claims			
5)	Claim(s) 22-44 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 30-44 is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 22-29 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement of the sheet (s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement of the sheet (s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement of the sheet (s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement of the sheet (s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement of the sheet (s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement of the sheet (s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement of the sheet (s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement of the sheet (s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement of the sheet (s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement of the sheet (s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement of the sheet (s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement of the sheet (s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement of the sheet (s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine Replacement of the sheet (s) including the correct the sheet (s) including the correct (s) in the sheet (s) including the correct (s) in the sheet (s) including the corr	r election requirement. r. epted or b) □ objected to by the ledrawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is objected to by the ledrawing(s) is objected to by the	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) [] a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau see the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
2) D Notice 3) D Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate	

Art Unit: 3746

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to the amendment of October 13, 2006. In making the below rejections the examiner has considered and addressed each of the applicant's arguments. The examiner notes that this amendment has been entered in part. The amendment to the claims and drawings have been entered, the amendments to the specification have not been entered. With regards to the specification, the examiner suggest supplying a substitute specification in the event that the applicant decides to continue prosecution.

Claim Objections

The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Misnumbered claims 23-43 been renumbered as claims 23-44.

The examiner notes that new claim 23 appears to include two claims. The second claim has been renumbered as claim 24 and the originally presented number of each claim thereafter has been increased by 1.

Claims 23-29 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The claims are dependent upon canceled claim 1. The examiner notes these claims have been considered as if they depend upon claim 22 for the purposes of examination.

Election/Restrictions

Newly submitted claims 30-44 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: claim 30, the independent claim, is directed to non-elected species related to the generation of power (species 3 of Species Set 3).

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 30-44 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 22-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to

one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claims present new matter by claiming, in claim 22, "at least one intake check valve", and "at least one outflow check valve" (similar subject matter is in claim 28). Also in claim 27 "one or more sealing rings" is new matter. With regards to these limitations, the original disclosure only provided support for a single element.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 23-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are presented and dependant upon the pump of claim 22 but the claims begin by stating that they are directed to one of the elements of the pump of claim 1. It is unclear if the entire pump or if just part of the pump is being claimed.

The examiner notes that claims 23 and 25 set forth desired results or design steps without specific reference to structure and thus do not clearly set forth the structure which is being claimed.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Page 5

Claims 22, 23, 25, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Villanueva et al.

As set forth in the previous office action Villanueva et al disclose the invention as claimed. The examiner notes that in Fig. 15 a-d flexible connector elements are shown. Additionally, the examiner notes that the ends of the cylinder (in Fig. 3) provides stops for the piston.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 26 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Villanueva et al in view of Anderson (USPN 4,442,887).

As set forth above Villanueva et al disclose a lifting buoy (1) connected to a piston (3) reciprocating in a cylinder (9), which has inlet and outlet check valves (5,9). Additionally as noted in fig. 15 the buoy can be connected to the piston by a flexible member. Villanueva et al do not disclose a mooring ring or a Houser guide. Anderson in Fig. 1 discloses a mooring ring (connected to chain 76A in Fig. 1A and a Houser guide (54). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the buoy with a mooring ring in order to provide a simple mechanism for securing the device in place. Additionally it would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 3746

ordinary skill in the art to provide a Houser assembly in order to ensure the smooth operation and guidance of the piston within the cylinder.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed October 13, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argued Villanueva required a rigid shaft. As noted in the above rejections, and also in Anderson, use a flexible shaft is well known.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3746

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles G. Freay whose telephone number is 571-272-4827. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30 A.M. to 5:30 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ehud Gartenberg can be reached on 571-272-4828. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

©harles G Freay Primary Examiner Art Unit 3746

CGF November 21, 2006